

QUESTION #	QUESTION	REFERENCE	RESPONSE
265	RFP paragraph L.14.2.d states that ‘Prime Offerors and all Subcontractors (regardless of dollar value) included in Exhibit 1A shall complete Exhibit 2A...’ and L.14.2.e states that ‘If any Subcontractor management and/or administrative labor categories are also proposed in Exhibit 1A, the respective Subcontractor shall also complete and submit Exhibit 2B’. However, Exhibits 2A and 2B provide only two options under the ‘Proposing Entity’ section, Prime Offeror or Significant Subcontractor. Please clarify whether subcontractors that are “not significant” (i.e. < 10% cost of performance) should be included in Exhibits 2A and 2B.	L.14.2(d), L.14.2(e)	The Exhibits 2a and 2b are incorrect, and the word "significant" should be deleted from the "subcontractor" option. See revised Exhibit 2A, issued via amendment #5
266	[Reference] Contractor shall implement comprehensive quality assurance for order processing processes, maintain the SEWP quality management system... data and documentation management, and records management [Question] Please provide the current SEWP quality assurance surveillance plan (or program) to be implemented by the Contractor.	Enclosure 2: RTO #2, Bullet #1	There is no separate or individual SEWP quality assurance surveillance plan. Offerors should refer to the GITISS Enclosure B - GOVERNMENT QUALITY ASSURANCE SURVEILLANCE PLAN.
267	[Reference] The contractor shall provide and maintain SEWP development and test environments separate from the production environment, to ensure proper validation of systems and applications prior to deployment to the production environment. How many systems and application releases occurred over the last year? What is the current hardware that supports the SEWP Development / Test Environment? How many servers etc...?	Enclosure 2, 1st Bullet	For purposes of the RTO2, the only IT assets that are part of the RTO are 2 Linux servers – one for hosting a website; one for an Oracle database plus 2 more similar servers for testing and two more for development
268	What are the current business hours of the SEWP Customer Service Support desk and are all the service desk support on-site or is there after hours support on-call?	Enclosure 2, 1st Bullet	The RTO business hours are 7:30am to 6:00pm Monday through Friday and is located on-site with no after hour support.
269	L.11(c)(6) states the inclusion of NASA FAR Supplement provisions 1852.245-80, “Government Property Management Information,” which is addressed in Section L.7. L.7(b), states that “The offeror shall provide the date of its last Government property control system analysis along with its overall status, a summary of findings and recommendations, the status of any recommended corrective actions, the name of the Government activity that performed the analysis, and the latest available contact information for that activity.” In the absence of a formal analysis of Government property control system that was performed by a Government activity on previous contracts, would it be acceptable to submit a government point of contact who can confirm satisfactory management of government property on a referenced contract for the prime or any of the subcontractor teammates?	L.11(c)(6)	Offerors shall have a system of internal controls to manage (control, use, preserve, protect, repair, and maintain) Government property in its possession. Section L of this solicitation contains NASA FAR Supplement provisions 1852.245 80, “Government Property Management Information” and 1852.245-81, “List of Available Government Property.” The information required by these two provisions shall be included in this volume. However, if an analysis of the Offeror’s property management policies, procedures, practices, and systems has not been previously performed by the Government, the Offeror shall describe their internal processes, systems, procedures, records, and methodologies to be employed to ensure effective and efficient control of Government property under this contract in accordance with the requirements specified in FAR 52.245-1, Government Property. See amendment #5.
270	RTO states: “Provide application hosting for MIS Systems”. What is the definition of “hosting”, Our assumption is that this speaks to the resources needed to provide operations, maintenance and support, and does not include providing hardware, backup systems, or the software. Please clarify. Please provide the application integrity, availability, and confidentiality requirements. This can be expressed by the following information: a. FIPS data categorization (high, medium, low) b. Current application availability SLA requirement c. Current response time SLA for support and backup/restore	RTO 1	Hosting is being used as a generic term that means maintain the applications and operating them in the appropriate environment. It would be a combination of application support and data center support and includes all three Tier levels. A) FIPS Medium; Application Availability: 95% non-critical and 99% for critical applications; SLA support full daily database backup and daily incremental and full weekly for servers; Restore within 8 hours.
271	SEWP is not listed as an application in the bidders library. To properly scope technical support can you please provide details to include: a. SEWP architecture and design b. Hardware platform c. Software products that make up SEWP d. If COTS what level of customization has been done to these products? e. Network architecture and hardware is not in the Data Center inventory	RTO 2	SEWP is not an application, SEWP is a program (Solutions for Enterprise-Wide Procurement (SEWP, pronounced 'soup'); a multi-award Government-Wide Acquisition Contract (GWAC) vehicle focused on IT products and product based services. For purposes of the RTO 2, the IT assets included to support SEWP are 2 Linux servers – one for hosting the website and one for an Oracle database, and 2 additional servers for testing and 2 more for development. No customization is required.
272	The scope of RTO 3 is to provide hosting and application support for all equipment within the ITCD data center. Both RTO 1 and 2 also provide hosting and operations support. This seems like a duplicative requirement as it is written. Can the government please provide clarity on what support for MIS and SEWP applications should be provided (if any) by RTO 3. If support is not provided by RTO 3 can the government please provide revised quantities of server and infrastructure that does not include the MIS and SEWP application environments?	RTO 1, 2 and RTO 3	RTO 3 provides the hosting and operations support for RTO 1 (MIS applications). RTO 3 provides hosting of the servers for RTO 3 (SEWP). An inventory list of all associated equipment (hardware/software) is detailed in the GITISS eLibrary.
273	Will the Government be willing and able to pay for the enhancements or are they expected to be improvements that do not require additional funding?	H.6, Contractor Proposed Enhancements (Sep 2013)	If proposed, the enhancement will be evaluated for reasonableness, effectiveness, and overall performance benefit. Since this is an IDIQ contract, for purposes of the evaluation of offerors, the Government will only assess the Offerors proposed enhancement(s) under the applicable Mission Suitability subfactor. During contract performance the Government will assess the associated benefit(s) of any proposed enhancement(s), including the cost impact(s), on a task-by-task basis. If warranted, the CO may make a determination to specifically waive the enhancement(s) on an individual task order basis.”
274	Should the parenthetical reference be to the versions of Word and Excel that are acceptable?	L.10(a)(4) states that electronic copies shall be submitted in “Microsoft Word and Excel (Windows XP) ...” Windows XP is an operating system.	The parenthetical reference should state Microsoft Office.
275	Would the Government allow all pricing excel sheets / exhibits to be submitted in one Excel book? This would help ensure formula and cell reference integrity.	Exhibits 1A-1B , 2A-2B. and 3-11	Yes it is acceptable to submit in one Excel workbook.
276	Please clarify the cost volume submission requirements for non-significant subcontractors. Questions & Answers Phase 2 indicated that non-significant subcontractors would not be required to submit a sealed cost volume, but L.14.2(d) pg. 83 requires non-significant subcontractors to complete Exhibit 2A.		Non significant subcontractors should submit Exhibit 2a, and 2b as applicable. See revised exhibits as per amendment #5

QUESTION #	QUESTION	REFERENCE	RESPONSE
277	[Reference] General Office Management Support... purchasing and management of office supplies Please provide further detail regarding the Contractor's role in purchasing office supplies. If the Contractor is required to purchase offices supplies, will the office supply costs be treated as other direct costs? Or, if the Contractor is purchasing office supplies from a GSFC internal stock room or from other federal required sources (e.g. GSA advantage), please specify purchasing authority (if any) and any financial reconciliation process that are required.	Enclosure 2: RTO #2	For this RTO, Offeror's may assume that office supplies are purchased via GSFC internal stock room.
278	Please provide required list of all deliverables that indicates the deliverable name, deliverable description, required format, due date, frequency, and the government POC that the deliverable is to be submitted.	Enclosure 2: RTO #2	RTO 2 is for he management and execution of the SEWP program office, everything from management and hosting of the website to administration of the program, answering phones, vendor management, etc.
279	According to the Government's response to question 18, there are currently 94 Work Year Equivalents (WYE) supporting GUEST, and the skill mix and labor categories for GITISS provided in the GPM are essentially the same as the current GUEST Contract. However Contract Year 1 of the GPM Exhibit 1, provided with the Final RFP, lists approximately 206 WYEs. It appears the GPM is not representative of the current GUEST workforce, which may provide the incumbent a competitive advantage. 1. Could the Government please clarify the apparent discrepancy and clarify which should be used as a basis for filling out the Exhibit 4 Source of Personnel? 2. Could the Government please provide the Labor Categories and Skill Mix hours for the current 94 WYE's on the GUEST contract, as well as the those required Day 1 of the contract (if different) in order for competitors to adequately address Phase-In and the Hiring Plan?	Questions and Answers Phase 1, Question & Answer 18	The SOW for the GITISS contract expands from what is currently being performed under the SOW of the GUEST contract. The GUEST task orders that will transition to the GITISS contract can be found in the GITISS Procurement Library. Exhibit 4 is required. Based on each Offeror staffing approach, both the incumbent and the non-incumbent may propose incumbent workforce to satisfy labor requirements.
280	This clauses lists that the government property provided as NONE. However Section G.3 refers to Property listed in Attachment H – please clarify.	L.8 1852.245-81	Amendment 3 was incorrect, since the Government is not providing Government Property but Installation Accountable Property. Amendment #5 will correct the reference to reflect that Attachment H is not Government Property but Installation Accountable Property.
281	Please clarify if the Contractor is to propose the Labor Category Position qualifications or if we are to use those in Enclosure A – Government Position Descriptions. Please clarify .	Page 5, Attachment B and Enclosure A	Offerors shall propose Position Qualification in accordance with the Mission Suitability Instructions.
282	Will the Government please clarify which members of the proposed team are required to complete and submit Attachment B (section 2(b)) and Exhibits 3 through 11 (sections 2(f) through 2(o))?	L.14.1, last paragraph states "...each Offeror, including proposed subcontractors, shall submit the other than certified cost and pricing data described in Section 2 below." This general statement seems to conflict with more specific statements in Section 2. For example, section 2(c) states Exhibit 1 is to be completed by the prime offeror only, section 2(d) states Exhibit 2 is to be completed by all subcontractors, and section 2(n) states Exhibit 10 is to be completed by all service subcontractors.	Only the prime offeror submits Attachment B. A proposed significant subcontractor shall complete and submit Exhibits 2A, 2B, and 4 through 11B. Non-significant subs shall submit 2A, and as applicable 2B.
283	Would the Government consider changing the requirements for submission of the Total Compensation Plan? The current requirement of the TCP to be submitted as part of Mission Suitability would require subcontractors to share proprietary information. Could the subcontractors' TCPs be submitted as part of their sealed bid? Or could hole-punched copies be sent in the sealed bid to later be placed into Mission Suitability by the evaluators?	L.10 pg. 67	Individual subcontractors may submit TCP directly to the Government NLT the proposal due date.
284	Could the Government please clarify as to which positions are to be bid as SCA under the applicable WD table?		Exhibit 1A contains the GPM-Specified Non-Management Direct Labor Categories that will be essential to perform the task orders under this contract. The Government Position Descriptions are provided as a guide to Offerors to fully understand the labor categories provided under exhibit 1A. As per the mission suitability instructions, Offerors are required to provide written position qualifications for the specific labor categories envisioned for this requirement. The position qualifications will also be incorporated into the resultant contract as Attachment B. Therefore, each Offeror shall review the Wage Determination and the Government provided positions description and respond with positions qualifications that are consistent with Service Contract Labor Standards, and classify its proposed labor categories as "exempt" or "non-exempt" positions.
285	The 2nd paragraph requests "a detailed phase-in plan that addresses...offeror's approach to phase-in... during the 30-day phase in period. The phase-in plan shall clearly demonstrate an ability to assume full contract responsibility on the effective date of the contract." <input type="checkbox"/> Is it the Government's intention that the phase-in period only cover the Award date activities through the start date of the contract (e.g., set up of infrastructure, incumbent capture, security requirements, etc.) For example: Contract Award is January 1 and contract start is January 30. The phase in period of January 1 – 30 period covers only ramp up activities and no professional services costs. OR <input type="checkbox"/> Is it the Government's intention that the phase-in period cover all costs from award date, including all labor costs of professional services, set up of infrastructure, incumbent capture, security requirements, etc. For example, the award date of the contract is December 31 and the start date of the contract is January 1. All professional services costs, as well as infrastructure, incumbent capture, security requirements, etc. are captured in the phase-in period of January 1 – 29. OR <input type="checkbox"/> Is it the Government's intention that the phase-in period cover a combination of or overlapping period of infrastructure / incumbent capture/ security requirements and then professional services costs? For example, if the phase in period is 4 weeks, the first 2 weeks activities are the infrastructure, incumbent capture, and security costs and the 2nd 2 weeks are the professional services costs, for a total of a phase in period of 4 weeks.	L.13, pg 77	The 45 day phase-in period includes the contract award date until the actual start date of the contract. The phase-in cost shall include all related costs offerors deem necessary to ensure continuity and a smooth transition with the incumbent Contractor to assume full contract responsibility on the effective date of the contract. The 45 day phase-in period is anticipated to begin on or about September 15, 2015. The contract year 1 is anticipated to start on or about November 1, 2015.
286	Please clarify if all subcontractors (less than 10% of the GPM) have to submit Exhibits 1A, 1B, 2A, 2B and 4 through 11B.	L.14 GSFC 52.215-223 COST VOLUME INSTRUCTIONS (AUG 2014), Page 79	See response to question 282.
287	Will the Government provide/identify which labor categories are covered under SCA?		See response to question 284

QUESTION #	QUESTION	REFERENCE	RESPONSE
288	First, will the ITCD provide clarification on the qualifying requirements of a significant subcontractor teammate’s referenced project? Second, are there any limits on the number of past performance projects that a significant subcontractor can provide in the proposal response.	Sections L.15.a and M.5 address past performance requirements for significant subcontractors: The qualifying requirements of a significant subcontractor teammate’s referenced project is stated in dollar terms in one place and as a percentage in another place. The description in Section L.15 (a) also seems to imply that the Offeror is the Prime contractor on the subcontractor teammate’s referenced project, which may not always be the case.	For purposes of past performance a significant subcontractor is defined as any proposed subcontractor that is estimated to meet/exceed an average annual cost/fee of \$4M. Significant subcontractor shall provide past performance questionnaires for those similar efforts within the last 3 years of the RFP release date with a minimum average annual cost/fee incurred of at least 10% of the estimated average annual dollar value of their proposed work.
289	Is it the expectation of the ITCD to use the equivalency rates for the specific labor categories as the basis for the fully burdened rate?	Attachment N Statement of Equivalency Rates, page 2; Enclosure A Government Position Descriptions Attachment N refers to the statement of equivalency rates for non-exempt employees, listed in Encl A Government Position Descriptions.	No this is for information purposes only. This is the basis on which offerors should use to establish their fully burdened rates for these specific labor categories.
290	Please identify the purpose of the worksheet entitled “Exhibit 2B (2)” it has no reference in the main RFP. Please provide the instructions to this spreadsheet.	Exhibit 2A-2B	2B(2) is not applicable to GITISS contract. See revised Exhibit 2A, issued via amendment #5
291	There is no row in Exhibit 3 for “Fringe Benefits” as requested in L.14.2(f). Should the Offeror add a row?	L.14.2(f)/Exhibit 3	Per the exhibit, Offerors may adjust elements of cost to be consistent with your current accounting system.
292	Instructions say “(Specify Type of Overhead Burden, e.g. Labor, Onsite, Offsite, Engineering, Procurement, Service Center(s), etc. - See Page 2)” What is Page 2?	Exhibit 6A	Page 2 refers to the type of overhead that should be included under Exhibit 6A. See examples that are listed on the exhibit.
293	Can the govt. clarify what it means by “Consolidations, improvements, and other changes shall be explained in detail with a clear, convincing rationale for every action”? In the cost, we cannot change the staffing and the hours given. Can the govt. clarify how it wants us to address this section?	L.13.3 Staffing Plan (Page 76)	Each Offeror shall address the requirements under mission suitability.
294	In Exhibit 1A, please confirm if the offeror has to use Government provided labor hours or hours based on our firms productive hours per year?	L.14.2(c )	The hours provided in the GPM shall not be adjusted. These are the expected productive hours required under the contract.
295	GPM Basis of Estimate - The BOE requirement is unclear. From the instructions, it seems that Government requires only process and methodology in estimating Program Management and Administrative support and subcontracting. Please clarify if the offeror needs to submit process and methodology in estimating Non Management support.	L.14.2(g)	The BOE information should include only contractor generated estimates, not the hours provided in the RFP for non-management labor.
296	As per QA, Proposed Significant Subcontractors, as described in Section L GSFC 52.215-223 Cost Volume Instructions, shall complete and submit Exhibits 2A, 2B, and 4 through 11B and provide the same supporting information that is requested from the Prime Offeror. Non-Significant Subcontractors are not required to submit cost exhibits. This conflicts with L.14 2(d) which required all subcontractors to submit Exhibit 2A. Please confirm if all subcontractors have to submit Exhibit 2A?	L.14	See response to 276
297	Can Government please list the cost submission requirement for significant subcontractor and any subcontractor?	L.14	See response to 276
298	What are the exempt positions as per Exhibit 1A?	L.14. Exhibit 1A	See response to 284
299	Please clarify if offeror will be evaluated favorably or unfavorably based on Exhibit 4. Exhibit 4 provides advantage to the incumbent as they have all the current staff to meet this requirement. We request Government to please remove this Exhibit to allow fair evaluation of all offerors.	L.14. Exhibit 4	Exhibit 4 is required. Based on each Offeror staffing approach, both the incumbent and the non-incumbent may propose incumbent workforce to satisfy labor requirements. The Offeror shall show the total number of staff proposed for each position, how many are available from within the company, how many will be newly hired and <b>the expected number of personnel to be hired from incumbents (if any)</b> . The Government will ensure that a fair and reasonable evaluation is conducted on each Offeror's proposal.
300	We request the Government to allow offeror to submit their calculation of Fringe, Overhead & G&A. The Exhibits 6A, 6B and 10A, B limits our ability to accurately portray our calculation of these indirect costs?	L.14	These exhibits are required. Offerors can submit supplemental data to support its indirect rate calculations.
301	The solicitation requires a Total Compensation Plan for all subcontracts (as defined in paragraph (d) of NFS provision 1852.231-71). Paragraph (d) of this provision limits this requirement to all service subcontractors:(1) who propose cost reimbursement or non-competitive FFP subcontracts with value in excess of \$500K, and (2) Cumulative TCV in excess of 10% of the prime’s TCV.Please confirm what pricing exhibits are required for Major Subcontractors bidding on a T&M basis.	L.14.2 (n) Page 77	The same pricing exhibits requirements are required for Major Subcontractors bidding on a T&M basis.
302	Can the Government confirm if the Major Subcontractors bidding on T&M basis have to submit a Total Compensation Plan?	L.14.2 (n) Page 77	See response to 301
303	Can the Government clarify what is meant by “contract level”? Are Offerors to assume that “contract level” means the first year at the IDIQ level?	Reference: L.14 GSFC 52.215-223 COST VOLUME INSTRUCTIONS (AUG 2014) 2. Cost Proposal Format (h) CONTRACT SOURCE OF PERSONNEL: “Exhibit 4 shows the Offeror’s plans to obtain the required personnel at the contract level. The Offeror shall show the total number of staff proposed for each position, how many are available from within the company, and how many will be newly hired for the first contract year.”	Contract level refers to all labor categories in the Government Pricing Model.
304	The tabs within Exhibit 1A list the ONSITE labor categories with allocated labor hours (column O). Will the Government provide clarification on what Offerors are to submit for the Offsite and Manufacturing (MFG) Site tables when there isn’t any workload data provided? Is it the Government’s intention for Offerors to staff the Offsite and MFG Site in addition to the Onsite personnel?	Exhibit 1A – 1B	Any sections of the GPM or lower level exhibits that refer to manufacturing or offsite non management direct labor are not applicable. See revised Exhibit 1A and 1B issued via amendment #5
305	Without knowing how the incumbent contract is currently staffed, how can Offerors propose which positions will be filled by the incumbent? This requirement benefits the incumbent contractor, who has the knowledge of how many personnel are on the current contract.	L.13 GSFC 52.215-210 MISSION SUITABILITY VOLUME INSTRUCTIONS (COMPETITIVE) (MAY 2014), 3. Mission Suitability Instructions by Subfactor, Subfactor B – Management Approach states: “The staffing plan shall include a comprehensive hiring plan which presents the expected number of personnel to be hired from incumbents (if any), those to be transferred from within the offeror’s own organization, and those from other sources.”	See response to 299. Offerors should use the labor categories and hours in the Government Pricing Model as the basis for staffing the GITISS contract.

QUESTION #	QUESTION	REFERENCE	RESPONSE
306	Are GPM Estimated Non-Mgmt ONSITE Direct Labor Hours in Column O in Exh 1A included in these functions? If not, are Offerors required to price these separately under Management and Administrative Labor Categories?	According to Enclosure A, “High Intermediate and Senior level staff positions may be assigned to provide oversight and training responsibilities for the lower level positions....”	Higher lever positions, may be assigned to provide oversight and training responsibilities for the lower level positions. However, hours associated with those responsibilities shall be accounted for under the Management and Administrative Hours/Costs Section of Exhibit 1A.
307	Can Offerors adjust GPM Estimated Non-Mgmt ONSITE Direct Labor Hours in Column O in Exh 1A in order to do oversight and training under management and administrative function?		No offerors shall not adjust non management nonsite direct labor hours for oversight and training. Those hours for oversight and training should be included in Management and Administration as applicable.
308	Do Offerors have to provide Exh 2B for each contract year?		Yes, offerors should provide Exhibit 2B for each contract year.
309	Will the Government please provide instruction for Exh 2B(2)?		2B(2) is not applicable to GITISS contract. See amendment 5.
310	Do Offerors have to provide Exh 2B (2) for each contract year?		2B(2) is not applicable to GITISS contract. See amendment 5.
311	Exh 4 Source Personnel requires Offerors to list personnel and state whether or not they will obtain incumbent employees. How are Offerors to answer the requirement without knowing how the current contract is staffed and which employees belong to the incumbent contractor? Will the Government provide the current contract’s staffing?		See response to 299. Exhibit 4 shall identify the sources to satisfy the staffing as reflected in the GPM.
312	I am looking to try and find out if a Cure Notice was issued to the incumbent vendor, ASRC. I am looking to try and confirm if this is the case and if it is possible to learn the purpose of the Cure Notice.		Question is not considered relevant for the GITISS procurement.
313	What is the plan for presenting the Task Orders currently supporting GITISS to the incoming contractor for phasing in? Will they all (40+) be presented during the 45 day Phase-In period, or will a percentage of them be presented, or will all of them be presented to the incoming contractor AFTER full contract performance begins?	Presentation of Task Orders to Incoming Contractor for Phasing-In.	Is anticipated that all current Task Orders in the GITISS elibrary will be transitioned to the new contract. All will be provided to the awardee during the 45 day phase-in period.
314	The direct labor and indirect rates and fee percentages included in Attachment B are “not to exceed” bid rates. Typically under a cost plus fee contract, contractors are reimbursed for their actual allowable incurred costs and not restricted with NTE amounts on their direct and indirect costs. The Offeror request that the “not to exceed” clause be deleted from the solicitation.	L.3 Type of Contract; Attachment B, pgs 2-4 (Not to exceed rates)	The “not to exceed” bid rates are only use to pricing the task orders. Since this is a cost type contract, the Government will pay all of the allowable, allocable and reasonable cost associated with the GITISS effort. Government will not delete the “not to exceed” from Attachment B.
315	Regarding minimum essential critical positions, the referenced requirement states: “The offeror shall identify its minimum essential critical positions required to meet all of the requirements of the SOW.” Would it be correct to understand this requirement to be equivalent to the personnel needed to maintain minimum operations during a government shutdown, in which case there would be a fairly small number of positions identified? If that understanding is not accurate would the Government expand upon the definition of those who would fall under this classification, so as to prevent differing interpretations among offeror	L.13.3 Mission Suitability Instructions, Subfactor B, Page 76	No, the offeror needs to identify its minimum essential critical positions required to meet <u>all of the requirements of the SOW</u> .
316	The referenced requirement states: “Prime Offerors and all Subcontractors (regardless of dollar value) included in Exhibit 1A shall complete Exhibit 2A, Non-Management Direct Labor Category Conversion”. Since a non significant sub is not required to provide any additional backup documentation as are significant subs, and this will be the only information submitted to the Government, does the Government have specific requirements and instructions for this submission?	L.14 Cost Volume Instructions Letter (d) Non-Management Direct Labor Category Conversion Instructions, Page 83	See response to 265
317	The government request that Offeror’s complete Exhibit 7 for any recurring ODCs, however no Exhibit 7 appears to have been provided. Can the government please provide Exhibit 7?	L.14 Cost Volume Instructions (k), Page 86, (ODCs),	Exhibit 7 was released as part of the GITISS RFP. Please reexamine Exhibits 3-11.
318	The Offeror finds that identifying and accurately pricing such ODCs is difficult at the IDIQ level. Additionally, some Offeror’s may under or over identify each item at the ODC making a fair comparison between Offeror’s difficult. Will the government provide a dollar figure to be bid by all Offeror’s for Other Direct Costs and have each Offeror identify their Cost Estimating Relationship for ODCs?	L.14 Cost Volume Instructions (k), Page 86 (ODCs)	No the government will not provide any dollar figures for ODC's. Recurring ODC's/CER's would be those charges unique to each offeror based on their accounting system and approach.
319	Attachment N contains a list of Non-Exempt Labor categories along with instructions to use the Step 2 rate for the applicable identified grade from a provided OPM website. Additionally RFP Attachment M provided the Wage Determination Schedule. When we mapped the RFP Labor Categories in Attachment N to the provided Wage Determination in Attachment M, we found that rates in the OPM website Step 2 of the corresponding grade do not match the rates in the Wage Determination Schedule (for example, Technical Writer I OPM Salary Table Step 2 is at \$17.04 and the Wage Determination Schedule has a rate of \$21.93). Will the Government provide the current mapping of RFP Labor Categories to the Wage Determination schedule? Also, can the Government confirm that only the rates in the Wage Determination Schedule will be applicable?”	Attachment N Subject: Wage Determination Labor Categories	See response to 284
320	In the government released Question and answers, Question 114 states: “Does the Total Compensation Plan requirement apply to either all Subcontractors or Significant Subcontractor?” RESPONSE: The Total Compensation Plan requirement is applicable to each offeror and its subcontracts that have a potential value in excess of \$500,000 and the cumulative value of all of the subcontractor’s service subcontracts under the prime contract is in excess of 10 percent of the prime contract’s potential value. Additionally, Question 116 states “Should the Total Compensation Plan be included in the Cost Volume or technical?” RESPONSE: The Total Compensation Plan is a requirement for Subfactor B in the Mission Suitability volume. Please refer to Section L for additional information.” Since significant subs will be submitting Volume III- Cost Volume but are required to submit a TCP which is part of Volume II – Mission Suitability, is it the Government’s intent to require significant subs to submit a Volume II that only includes a TCP since the other items that are part of that volume are not required (Phase-in Plan, Safety Plan and Health Plan)?	Total Compensation Plan (TCP)	Subcontractors may submit individual TCP directly to the Government NLT that the proposal due date and time.
321	Formula’s within the exhibit apply Indirect costs different than our approved cost estimating process. Can the formula’s for applying the CY Indirect Bid Rates be changed to conform with our approved cost estimating process?	Exhibit 2A	Yes formulas maybe adjusted.
322	It is stated in the instructions: “Offerors, including proposed significant subcontractors, shall provide one separately packaged copy of their cost proposal marked for their cognizant DCAA auditing office with their proposal. The name, mailing address, email address, and phone number of the cognizant DCAA office are to be included in the written narrative of the Offer Volume as well as Exhibit 11A . . .” Question: Are significant subcontractors required to submit an Offer Volume as well as a Cost Volume?	Section L.14	No, significant subcontractors should not submit an Offer Volume.
323	Since the Government plans to award CPFF IDIQ type prime contracts, will the Government allow T&M type subcontracts on awarded Task Orders?	Section L.3	Please review the requirements of the GITISS requirement and propose an approach that will meet the GITISS objectives



QUESTION #	QUESTION	REFERENCE	RESPONSE
324	Section L.13.1 of the RFP states "The offeror shall include Contract Attachment L as part of the model contract in the Contract Volume of their proposal." Is it acceptable to include the completed Attachment L as an appendix to the Offer Volume?	Section L.13.1	Yes, it is acceptable.
325	When composing our past performance references, is the Government looking for 'comparability to the proposed effort' relating to SOW sections 1.3 through 1.7, or are they wanting us to show comparability to SOW 2.1-2.8 as well?	Section L.15.a	Offerors are to primarily address the SOW requirements listed under the past performance questionnaire listed under the Exhibit 13.
326	SOW 1.7d, states that the contractor must support to meet NASA's information system continuous monitoring (ISCM) requirements; does NASA Goddard have a documented ISCM strategy or plan? If yes, can you please make this accessible?	SOW, 1.7 d	GSFC uses the NASA continuous monitoring requirements outlined in ITS-HBK-2810.02-04 Security Assessment and Authorization: Continuous Monitoring – Annual Security Control Assessments (and related guidance and ITS-HBKs identified in NPR2810.1A), that is consistent with the evolving NIST guidance. NASA is integrating the emerging plans to implement the Federal Continuous Diagnostics and Mitigations (CDM) implementation goals. See also questions #9 and #268.
327	Exhibit 4 asks that we identify which personnel we will capture from the incumbent by labor category. Please provide a break down of all incumbent personnel by labor category or provide alternative instructions to complete this Exhibit.		See response to 299. Exhibit 4 should list the Offeror's plans to obtain the required personnel at the contract level including the total number of staff proposed for each position, including how many are available from within the company, and how many will be newly hired for the first contract year.
328	Since the Government requires company estimated cost per hour of fringe benefits and the amount of employee contribution as a percentage of total cost of the benefit, will any financial factors be considered in the Government's evaluation of offerors' Total Compensation Plan?	M.3, "Mission Suitability Factor"	The Total Compensation Plan will be evaluated as stated under the provisions of M.3
329	The matrix description states that the Contractor "shall not exceed the indirect rates" proposed. Such a cap on indirect rates appear to be unusual for a CPFF contract, given that the Government would receive 100% of any savings the Contractor would generate, while the Contractor would be responsible for 100% of any overruns. Would the Government consider either (1) changing the type of award to either T&M or CPIF to allow the Contractor to benefit from controlling costs, or (2) eliminate the not to exceed cap on indirect rates?	Attachment B	See response to 314
330	Based on any contractor proposed enhancements, may the offeror propose additional labor categories? If so, would those additional labor categories be presented in offeror's response to this section?	Attachment L	See response to 273. If proposed, and the Offeror's enhancement requires additional labor categories, then those should be proposed under the Management And Administration labor categories section of Exhibit 1A.
331	Given that the Wage Determination requires the Contractor to provide 2 weeks' paid vacation after 1 year of service with contractor or successor; 3 weeks after 5 years of service; and 4 weeks after 15 years of service, will the Government provide information to allow the offeror to estimate the number of SCA employees that, if hired, would receive more than 2 weeks' vacation based on their years of service?	Attachment M	That information is not available
332	Is the list of equipment provided in Attachment H complete?		Yes, the list is considered complete.
333	How many Task Orders are expected to be awarded annually?		That information is not available at this time
334	The last sentence states "BOE's must be provided by that significant subcontract following the above specified format." It is unclear what is required to be compliant. (1) Is the subcontractor providing its response to the first two paragraphs relating to insight into processes and methodologies into any Program Management and Administrative Support they may be providing the Prime Offeror? (2) If not, can additional clarification/instructions be provided to help the offeror's understanding of what is required? For example: Is the intent for the subcontractor to do the BOE for areas other than Program Management and Administrative Support?	Section L.14	Significant subs shall provide a BOE to describe and support any contributions to the management and administrative functions under the contract. Also, please review the page limitations listed for the BOEs.
335	Assuming the Government does not eliminate the not-to-exceed cap identified in Attachment B matrices, (1) will the Government Pricing Model be used as the proposed evaluated price and therefore would Attachment B not-to-exceed rate be used to determine probable cost? (2) If the Government determines any cost proposed in Attachment B to be unrealistic but the contractor is willing to accept a not-to-exceed amount, would the probable cost be at the not-to-exceed amount and would any differences be identified as cost risk associated with the proposal? (3) Technically, would this be a cost risk or would it only require the offeror to demonstrate its financial capability to perform at the not-to-exceed rates?	Section M.4	The total FFP Phase-In price and the proposed and probable Government Pricing Model evaluated cost (including proposed fee amount) will be presented to the Source Selection Authority as well as any cost risk associated with the proposal. The Offerors' and Subcontractors' individual direct labor categories/rates and indirect rates used in Exhibit 2B must match those proposed in Attachment B DIRECT LABOR RATES, INDIRECT RATES, AND FEE MATRICES.
336	K.1(b)(1) states, "If the provision at 52.204-7, System for Award Management, is included in this solicitation, paragraph (d) of this provision applies." Section L.1 lists 52.204-7, System for Award Management (Jul 2013), as a provision incorporated by reference. For 8(a) Joint Ventures formed specifically for this procurement, which do not have Certifications and Representations listed in SAM, should we list the SAM references for each partner in the Joint Venture?	K.1(b)(1)	Offeror should list SAM references for each partner in the JV. This would be the only option if the JV was formed specifically for a procurement and the JV has not been approved by SBA yet.
337	L.10(b)(2) of the RFP states, "A page is defined as one side of a sheet, 8-1/2" x 11", with at least one inch margins on all sides, using not smaller than 12 point type Times New Roman font. Line spacing or the amount of vertical space between lines of text shall not be less than single line (Microsoft Word's default line spacing). Is there a minimum amount of space that needs to be included between paragraphs?	L.10(b)(2)	Paragraph spacing shall also be "Normal", not "Expanded" or "Condensed."
338	Is this the entire inventory to be supported at contract start and does it encompass all of the RTO requirements?	Attachment H	Yes, this is list of Installation Accountable Property for performance of the GITISS contract.
339	There is very little network infrastructure (e.g., switches, etc.) in the equipment list. Is the network infrastructure supported in another way or is there a separate equipment list for this role?	Attachment H	The network infrastructure is supported by other contracts and is not included as part of the GITISS contract.
340	Are any incumbent positions subject to Wage Determination?	Attachment M	See response to question 284
341	How do the non-Management direct labor categories in Exhibit 1A map to the Wage Determination labor categories in Attachment M? Or, which Exhibit 1A categories are subject to wage determination?	Attachment M and Exhibit 1A	See response to question 284
342	The list of available property (an attachment/enclosure to the RFP) is not referenced here. Is that because the provided list is not governed under FAR 52.245-1 or FAR 52.245-2, or is this just an omission?	L.8 (a) and (b)	Attachment H list the Installation Accountable Government Property

QUESTION #	QUESTION	REFERENCE	RESPONSE
343	In Section M.3.1 under Subfactor A—Understanding the Technical Requirement/RTOs, the RFP states, “The Government will evaluate the offeror’s description of any new or innovative methods, techniques or technologies for efficiency and effectiveness.” a. Please define what is meant by “new.” Does this mean that the method, technique or technology has been developed within the past 5 years? Or does this mean that the method, technique, and/or technology is new to NASA? b. Please define “innovative” in this context. c. If a method, technique or technology is truly new or innovative, what methodology will NASA employ to determine its efficiency and effectiveness? How will it be rated to ensure a fair evaluation?	M.3.1 under Subfactor A	<b>The Government will assess what each Offeror considers to be new or innovative methods, techniques or technologies.</b> As stated in the Mission Suitability instructions, efficiencies shall be quantified where possible. The Government will ensure that a fair and reasonable evaluation is performed.
344	The RFP states: "for the purposes of the Past Performance Volume, a proposed significant subcontractor is defined as any proposed subcontractor that is estimated to meet/exceed an average annual cost/fee of \$4M."  The issue with this is that the \$4 Million threshold is inconsistent with that of the Cost Volume (10% of the proposed Government Pricing Model), and forces the Prime to subcontract a significantly higher percentage of work share than necessary in order for past performance of their key subcontractors to be evaluated. The need to subcontract additional dollars to meet this requirement ultimately leads to higher costs for GSFC, and is not in either the vendor or the government’s best interest.  We’d suggest that GSFC consider amending the annual cost/fee requirement from "\$4 Million" to "10% of the GPM," bringing the definition of a significant subcontractor in the Past Performance Volume into alignment with that of the Cost Volume.  Our understanding is that the \$4 Million requirement was calculated as 10% annually of GSFC's estimated ~\$200 Million over 5 year ceiling, with the discrepancy being that the Ceiling value is significantly higher than that of an offeror’s proposed GPM.  If you could please consider this we’d be very appreciative.		The past performance threshold for the significant subcontract remains unchanged.
345	Can GSFC please clarify whether subcontractors should provide rates for every labor category in Exhibit 2a, or only categories in which they’re proposed to perform under Exhibit 1A?	L.14.2d - Cost Proposal Format – Non–Management Direct Labor Category Conversion (P. 83–84)	Subcontractors shall provide rates in Exhibit 2a for labor categories in which they are proposed to perform under Exhibit 1A
346	The RFP states: "The offeror shall include Contract Attachment L as part of the model contract in the Contract Volume of their proposal." There is no volume entitled, "Contract Volume." Please clarify where the Contractor Proposed Enhancements should be presented. Please confirm that this is not page count.	L.13.1, General Instructions; Contractor Proposed Enhancements (Attachment L	Contract Attachment L is not page limited.
347	I'm writing to inform you of an issue we believe will have some unintended negative consequences with regards to Cost Proposals for GITISS. The RFP states: "for the purposes of the Past Performance Volume, a proposed significant subcontractor is defined as any proposed subcontractor that is estimated to meet/exceed an average annual cost/fee of \$4M."The issue with this is that the \$4 Million threshold is inconsistent with that of the Cost Volume (10% of the proposed Government Pricing Model), and forces the Prime to subcontract a significantly higher percentage of work share than necessary in order for past performance of their key subcontractors to be evaluated. The need to subcontract additional dollars to meet this requirement ultimately leads to higher costs for GSFC, and is not in either the vendor or the government’s best interest. We'd suggest that GSFC consider amending the annual cost/fee requirement from "\$4 Million" to "10% of the GPM," bringing the definition of a significant subcontractor in the Past Performance Volume into alignment with that of the Cost Volume. Our understanding is that the \$4 Million requirement was calculated as 10% annually of GSFC's estimated ~\$200 Million over 5 year ceiling, with the discrepancy being that the Ceiling value is significantly higher than that of an offeror’s proposed GPM. If you could please consider this we’d be very appreciative.		Your understanding as to how the Government calculated the significant subcontractor is incorrect. With that, the past performance threshold for the significant subcontract remains unchanged.
348	Is it permissible for the Prime Offeror to complete Exhibit 4 and significant subcontractors to reference the Prime Offeror?		That's not permissible. Exhibit 4 identifies the source of personnel for subcontracted labor as well as prime contractor labor, and each significant subcontractor shall identify its source(s) of labor.
349	Must each significant subcontractor submit a Total Compensation Plan under Mission Suitability Subfactor B? If so, may it be submitted as a sealed submission directly to the Government?		Yes each significant subcontractor should submit a TCP and may submit it sealed directly to the Government.
350	Will you change to due date for questions so that the question period is not renewed each time there is an extension?		With the release of amendment #5, all questions pertaining to the RFP have been answered. No further questions may be entertained if submitted later than 12:00 pm of March 3, 2015.
351	We respectfully requests an extension to the February 6 deadline to allow us time to complete our proposals based on Q&A responses and produce them in accordance with RFP requirements.		March 13, 2015 at 3:00pm local time is current proposal due date
352	We have retrieved the current GITISS RFP documents/updates. We noticed that the amendment files appear to be missing AMEND-002-003. Was this an actual document or perhaps just skipped over? POSTED:160411-AMEND-002-001160411-AMEND-002-002160411-AMEND-002-004-1160411-AMEND-002-005		We reviewed the NAIS and all documents appear to have been posted
353	Question #33 asked for clarification on the "ceiling" established by an offeror's Direct, Indirect, and Fee Rates, and whether that "ceiling" would only be used for the proposal effort and not as a ceiling for incurred costs during contract performance/delivery. The Government confirmed the assumption and stated that "Attachment B establishes the Not To Exceed Rates that will be used for pricing/negotiating individual task orders. These are not ceiling for performance." However, this interpretation of the "Direct Labor Rates, Indirect Rates, and Fee Matrices" requirement appears to be in conflict with the language in the Solicitation. Should offerors assume that the Questions & Answers take precedence over the Final RFP?		Offerors shall assume that the rates in Attachment B are not to exceed bid rates for purposes of task estimation in response to issued task orders. There are no reimbursement ceilings created by the Attachment B rates or in the solicitation or the anticipated contract that would constitute a limitation on incurred costs based on exceeding Attachment B rates.
354	To ensure that all offerors are competing on an even playing field and adhering to the same proposal instructions, We respectfully requests that the Government release a revised copy of the Final RFP that conforms to the Answers provided by the Government in Amendment 002.		Please advise the Government of you specific concern. With the release of this Q&A, all questions have been answered.

QUESTION #	QUESTION	REFERENCE	RESPONSE
355	Section L.14.c(c) states that the Prime Offeror shall complete the OFFEROR NON-LABOR RECURRING ODCS AND/OR COST-ESTIMATING RELATIONSHIP COSTS Section of Exhibit 1A, filling in all Non-labor recurring other direct costs (ODCs) and/or cost estimating relationships (CERs) consistent with Exhibit 7'.Section L.14.2(k) states that the 'Recurring ODCs and CERs listed in Exhibit 7 must match those proposed in Section 3 of Attachment B, DIRECT LABOR RATES, INDIRECT RATES, AND FEE MATRICES... If you do not have any established CERs, insert "NONE" in this exhibit'. <b>Question: Though the instructions for Exhibit 1A state that 'columns may be adjusted in this area as necessary to achieve clarity', Exhibit 7 and Section 3 of Attachment B do not facilitate entry of ODCs that are not established using CERs. If an Offeror does not have any CERs, and does not include recurring ODCs in its indirect expenses, how should the Offeror present the ODCs in Exhibit 7 and Section 3 of Attachment B in order to ensure consistency between the exhibits/attachment?</b>	L; Exhibit 1A; Exhibit 7;Section 3 of Attachment B	Offerors shall complete Exhibit 7 for any recurring ODCs (e.g. computer usage, program management, depreciation, administrative support, etc.) routinely bid on an established Cost Estimating Relationship (CER) in accordance with your current accounting system (note that the recurring ODC is captured in the form of a CER, and these are not exclusive terms). As such, if your company accounting system/approach does not utilize CERs as a method for charging expenses for recurring ODCs (as distinct from ODC costs that arise as a result of specific contract/task order requirements, e.g. travel or materials), then you would not identify any applicable CERs for recurring ODCs in Exhibit 7 or Attachment B.
356	We have reviewed Amendment 02 and associated Q&A documents that were posted on the FBO website Friday evening. Unfortunately, not all of the questions that we submitted were answered. Will there be future Q&As released? Should our Pricing Management team assume that the remaining questions will not be answered?		With the release of this Q&A, all questions have been answered.
357	We are still awaiting responses to some of our questions. Could you kindly let us know when you will be releasing the answers to the rest of questions?		See response to 356
358	I've reviewed the Government's responses to bidder questions in Amendment 2 for the NASA GITISS RFP, and noticed that not all bidder questions were addressed. Could you please advise on the Government's timeframe for responding to all bidder questions?		See response to 356
359	It was noted that Amendment file 160411-AMEND-002-002 is inconsistent with regard to Sections L and M updates. Change #2: The amendment update to Section L.13 continues to refer to the 'backup plan'. "Additionally, offerors shall provide a backup plan that describes the approach the Offeror would take if its primary staffing approach was not successful. "Change #5: The amended Section M.3 changed the title of the backup plan to the 'backup approach'. "The Government will evaluate the offeror's backup approach to its primary staffing approach for completeness and effectiveness "Will the government please clarify whether the correct title is the 'backup plan' or the 'backup approach' and do you intend to issue an amendment to align Sections L and M.		The correct description is "back-up" plan. See amendment #5.
360	After careful review of the Questions and Answers, there is a concern about the conflict between what is stated in Solicitation NNG14475415R, Section L 14.2(b), paragraph 1, page 81 and the Government's response to Question #33. Question #33 asked for clarification on the "ceiling" established by an offeror's Direct, Indirect, and Fee Rates, and whether that "ceiling" would only be used for the proposal effort and not as a ceiling for incurred costs during contract performance/delivery. The Government confirmed the assumption and stated that "Attachment B establishes the Not To Exceed Rates that will be used for pricing/negotiating individual task orders. These are not ceiling for performance." However, this interpretation of the "Direct Labor Rates, Indirect Rates, and Fee Matrices" requirement appears to be in conflict with the language in the Solicitation. Should offerors assume that the Questions & Answers take precedence over the Final RFP?		There is no conflict. See response to 265
361	I respectfully request that you investigate why our questions have not yet been answered, and if these questions (along with potentially other questions from other organizations) were inadvertently not included due to a mix-up with the files that were posted on February 6		See response to 356
362	In solicitation NNG14475415R, Amendment 2 the following paragraph was dropped from page 2 of revised Enclosure A. Was this an oversight or are the oversight and training positions now viewed differently? Government Position Descriptions High Intermediate and Senior level staff positions may be assigned to provide oversight and training responsibilities for the lower level positions (i.e., Junior, Low Intermediate, Intermediate). Hours associated with those responsibilities shall be accounted under the Management and Administrative Labor exhibit. Additionally, the Offerors shall give the Government insight into the cost estimating thought processes and methodologies used by the Offeror in estimating those hours.		That was corrected; however, the paragraph was replaced with the following: "Higher lever positions, may be assigned to provide oversight and training responsibilities for the lower level positions. However, hours associated with those responsibilities shall be accounted for under the Management and Administrative Hours/Costs Section of Exhibit 1A."
363	This email is in reference to Amendment 2 released on 1/30/2015 for the NASA GITISS Solicitation NNG14475415R. It appears that "Amend-002 -003" was not included in the original release of documents. Does the government anticipate issuing additional answers to questions prior to the proposal submittal date?		See response to 356
364	Question & Answer #40: The Government response was stated as "The government will provide space for onsite personnel." Does this response mean the government will NOT provide (a) desks, (b) phones, (c) desktop computers, and (d) other peripheral office equipment? Please clarify whether the Contractor is expected and will be able to provide them items as contractor-furnished equipment onsite at government locations.		The Government will provide office space for on-site performance to include desk, phones, etc.
365	The subject question asks whether a discussion of terminated contracts is to be included in the Past Performance volume" but this is answered with the following question: "Discussion of terminated contracts should be included in the Past Performance volume?". Please clarify whether there still is a requirement for including contract terminations in the Past Performance Volume, not subject to page count. [As background, the Draft RFP included the following paragraph that was originally the last bullet under what became L.15 Past Performance Volume, paragraph (a) Information from the Offeror, but which was removed in the Final RFP issued on 12-15-2014: List any contracts terminated (partial or complete) within the past 5 years and basis for termination (convenience or default). Include the contract number, name, address, and telephone number of the terminating officer (please verify telephone numbers). Include contracts that were "descoped" by the customer because of performance or cost problems. (Excluded from the page limitation).] If this requirement is now being restored to the RFP we request that you issue an amended Section L.15 to reflect that reinsertion of the deleted paragraph. If there is no requirement for information regarding contract terminations please confirm that is still the case.	Amendment 003 Questions and Answers released on February 6, 2015, Question 233/217 (Contract Terminations for Past Performance)	The requirement to "List any contracts terminated (partial or complete) within the past 5 years and basis for termination (convenience or default). Include the contract number, name, address, and telephone number of the terminating officer (please verify telephone numbers). Include contracts that were "descoped" by the customer because of performance or cost problems. (Excluded from the page limitation)." The above paragraph was inadvertently deleted from the GITISS Final RFP. Previous response expected the requirement to be there. However, since the Final RFP omitted this requirement, there is no past performance requirement to include the above discussion on terminated contracts. This responses supersedes our previous response(s).

QUESTION #	QUESTION	REFERENCE	RESPONSE
366	<p>In response to a question asking whether the requirement for Minimum Essential Critical Positions had to do with minimal SOW coverage for short term emergencies such as weather closures, the first sentence of the Government’s response was: “As part of offeror's Staffing approach, the Offeror shall identify its minimum essential critical positions required to meet all of the requirements of the SOW.” The answer went on to state that “Critical Operations Personnel, Mission Essential Personnel, or non-Essential Personnel criteria's (sic) are used to determine personnel required to work during short term emergencies and/or weather-related closures”. Request further clarification to eliminate the incorrect interpretations of this response, and the requirement in general, by answering the following related questions:</p> <p>a. Is it correct to understand that positions identified as “minimum essential critical positions” are expressly for the purpose of supporting essential functions of the SOW within the context of short term emergencies and/or weather-related closures?</p> <p>b. Alternatively, are minimum critical essential positions considered to be a substantially larger set of positions needed to meet all requirements of the SOW under normal operating conditions, out of which a subset of “Operations Critical” and “Mission Essential” personnel are identified for minimal support under short term emergencies and/or severe weather conditions?</p> <p>c. If item b. is the correct understanding, would the Government provide a basis for developing the full list of staffing sufficient to perform the entire SOW at a minimum level, given the Government response to another recent question indicating that GUEST Task Orders from 2010 in the GITISS eLibrary do not address the full set of GITISS contract requirements?</p>	Amendment 002 Questions and Answers released on January 30, 2015, Question 11 (Minimum Essential Critical Positions)	<p>The Mission Suitability Instructions require vendors to identify its minimum essential critical positions required to meet <b><u>all of the SOW requirements</u></b>. The inclusion of the Critical Operations Personnel, Mission Essential Personnel, or non-Essential Personnel sentence was an attempt to provide a distinction between them. Offerors are not required to address “Critical Operations Personnel, Mission Essential Personnel, or non-Essential Personnel that are needed to support short time emergencies and/or severe weather; rather, based on each Offeror unique approach, vendors are to identify its minimum essential critical positions required to meet all of the SOW requirements, not just the essential function, <b><u>but all of the SOW requirements</u></b>.</p>
367	Could you please advise on the Government’s timeframe for releasing responses to all bidder questions?		See response to 356
368	<p>Reference the GITISS solicitation based on the questions asked a few times, we are still confused and unsure how a significant sub is evaluated for cost purposes. Based on the verbiage in the RFP L.15(a) it looks like for the Cost Volume purposes a sub is significant if their workshare in the GPM is at least 10% of the GPM. So as an example, if hypothetically the Total GPM value is \$150 Million a significant sub must have at least 10% share of that or about \$3 million workshare annually in order for the past performance of the sub to be considered in the evaluation. Is this a correct understanding of the clause or regardless of any of this, the significant sub’s workshare must at minimum be \$4million? I would appreciate a detail answer for us and many others who want this clarified.</p>		<p>For purposes of cost a significant subcontractor is defined as a subcontractor expected to exceed 10% or more of the Government Pricing Model (GPM) total estimated cost value. For purposes of past performance a significant sub is defined as any proposed subcontractor that is estimated to meet/exceed an average annual cost/fee of \$4M</p>
369	Could you please advise on the Government’s timeframe for releasing responses to all bidder questions?		See response to 356